Action items are highlighted in red.

Review what happens when customers move between rate classes and ARES is using UCB/POR? (Issue #012)

This is a clarification for ComEd. The current issues log correctly reflects the Ameren business practice. The issues log will be updated with the following ComEd practice. Like Ameren, ComEd is proposing all-in or all-out by customer group. When a customer moves from a UCB/POR group to a non-UCB/POR group, or the customer grows to greater than 400 kw, then the 814C will be sent to the RES. The customer will remain on UCB/POR for one additional month during which the RES can drop the customer or select for SBO. If no action is taken, the next month the customer will default to Dual billing. If a customer that is not on UCB/POR moves into a UCB/POR group, the 814C will be sent and the customer will remain on UCB/POR for one additional month. If no action is taken, the customer will default to UCB/POR the following month.

Off-Cycle Switch with UCB/POR (Issue #059)

ComEd can't off-cycle switch a customer that is on, going to or coming off of UCB/POR. They are proposing that any off-cycle switch request for non-Mass Market accounts involving UCB/POR be defaulted to on-cycle. (Note that off-cycle switches are not allowed for any Mass Market account) Ameren does not have this limitation, but would consider adopting the ComEd practice for uniformity. The final decision on this issue may also impact Ameren's drop rules which currently allow off-cycle drops for this customer class. This issue will be discussed further at the workshop on October 22nd.

Seamless Moves (Issue #034)

Customers that move from one premise to another (old account closed, new account created) will be treated as new accounts. ARES will need to reenroll the account using the standard DASR process. See issue #52 for limitation on new accounts. This issue will be revisited at a later date.

New Connects - Can ARES serve customer from Day 1? (Issue #052)

New accounts must bill on a native supply tariff/rider for at least one bill cycle. Neither utility's billing systems can currently accept a DASR for an inactive or pending-active account. The utilities currently work these requests manually, but the systems really aren't designed to do it. This issue will be revisited at a later date.

POR Flag on Enrollment Request (Issue #057)

In Phase I, UCB/POR is a combined product. However, the law provides, and the utilities plan to offer stand-alone UCB and POR products in the future. In order to establish an audit trail and to facilitate a seamless transition to the stand-alone products, the utilities would like to establish a requirement in the initial implementation that RES specify the election of both UCB and POR on the enrollment DASR. The group agreed that this should be done. This requirement will be passed back to the CPWG.

Enrolling accounts with 60 days arrears - not eligible for UCB/POR (Issue #058) Ameren's filed tariff specifies that an account with a greater than 60 day arrears is not eligible for UCB/POR. The group agreed that the enrollment should be rejected. This issue will be passed to the CPWG to determine the proper reason code to use on the rejection.

However, this led to further discussion about rejection reason codes. The utilities do not want to convey payment history information to the RES. However, the RES want to know specifically if the enrollment is rejected because the customer is on a return-to-bundle hold or for some other reason. The group agreed to use a unique reason code for the return-to-bundle hold. The recommendation was to use a temporarily ineligible reason code for all other reasons. This would include the 60 day arrears issue, but would also include situation where the customer can't be switched because a meter hasn't been set yet at the premise. Since this reason code is not specific, no payment history information would be conveyed. This issue will be discussed further at the workshop on October 22nd.

Ameren Only – For Rate-Ready, do ARES want to be able to back-date rates? The group decided that the ability to back-date rates is not needed.

Torsten asked for any issues that anyone would like to discuss at the next workshop on October 22^{nd} . There were no responses.

SBWG Issues List

An updated issues list will be sent prior to the workshop on Oct. 22nd.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the SBWG has not been scheduled.